

Inflation is what happens when you have too many dollars chasing too few goods and services. And a big reason for our current inflation situation is the Democrats' decision to pour a lot of unnecessary government money into the economy earlier this year, despite—despite, I might add—being warned that their partisan \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan spending spree could stoke inflation.

And you don't have to take my word for it. Here is what former Obama economic adviser Jason Furman had to say recently when discussing our inflation problem:

The original sin was an oversized American Rescue Plan. It contributed to both higher output but also higher prices.

That quote from Mr. Furman appeared in a New York Times article that also noted:

But some economists, including veterans of previous Democratic administrations, say much of Mr. Biden's inflation struggle is self-inflicted. Lawrence H. Summers is one of those who say the stimulus bill [that] the president signed in March gave too much of a boost to consumer spending. . . . Mr. Summers, who served in the Obama and Clinton administrations, says inflation now risks spiraling out of control and other Democratic economists agree there are risks.

Again, that is from the New York Times.

Inflation is spiraling out of control, and Democrats are preparing to throw more fuel on the fire. That is right. Democrats are preparing to double down on the strategy that helped get us in this mess in the first place and pass yet another massive government spending bill.

I am not sure whether Democrats simply don't care about the inflation situation facing American families or whether they are operating under the delusion that they can somehow pass another major government spending bill without serious consequences for the economy.

Regardless, there is no question that pouring another \$1.75 trillion in government money into the economy would likely make our inflation crisis even worse than it is today.

I say \$1.75 trillion because that is what Democrats have been selling as the pricetag for their so-called Build Back Better plan. But as we learned on Friday of last week from the Congressional Budget Office's latest analysis, the Democrats' spending spree would far exceed \$1.75 trillion. When you take away the shell games and budget gimmicks, the Democrats' spending spree would cost almost \$5 trillion—5 trillion. And, of course, the tax hikes in the Democrats' plan, as large as they are, wouldn't even come close to funding that amount.

The Democrats' Build Back Better proposal, if implemented over 10 years, as they plan, would add an eye-popping \$3 trillion to our national debt. It turns out that Build Back Better is more like "Build Back Bankrupt."

Democrats have attempted to disguise the true cost of their "Build

Back Bankrupt" plan by strategically sunseting various provisions before the end of the bill's 10-year budget window. Of course, Democrats have never had any intention of actually sunseting these provisions. But by claiming that they are going to sunset these measures, they have been able to sort of disguise the fact that their spending spree would actually cost nearly \$5 trillion.

That is the Congressional Budget Office, not me. The Congressional Budget Office, last Friday said, if extended—the 10-year window—this bill would cost \$5 trillion.

Democrats are implicitly admitting that they plan to extend these programs, but they are saying that people shouldn't worry, that the cost of these extensions will be offset. Well, I would like to know just how exactly they plan to do that.

With massive new tax hikes, on top of the tax hikes they have already included in their bill—just how many tax hikes do Democrats think our economy can handle?

And if Democrats had a plan for future offsets, why didn't they include those offsets in their bill, in the first place, along with an honest accounting of the length of their programs?

Is it because they thought that the American people would balk if they knew the true cost of the bill, that they might not be crazy about the idea of a bill that would cost them \$5 trillion?

I am hard-pressed to think of anything more irresponsible than for Democrats to pass their Build Back Better—or their "Build Back Bankrupt"—measure right now. Inflation is soaring, as I have just pointed out, and there is no clear end in sight. Even the Federal Reserve is now acknowledging that this isn't transitory. They removed that word from their description.

We are emerging from a pandemic that required a lot of government expenditure and a corresponding increase in our debt, and we have no idea what government money might be needed down the road.

Passing a \$5 trillion spending spree that would add \$3 trillion to our national debt is the very last thing that we should be doing.

I hope that at least some of my Democrat colleagues will think better of their spending plans before the American people are forced to discover just what "Building Back Bankrupt" is really like.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 576, Samantha D. Elliott, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Brian Schatz, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jacky Rosen, Chris Van Hollen, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher Murphy, Ron Wyden.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Samantha D. Elliott, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 495 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Tillis
Cornyn	Menendez	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeben	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Lummis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the